IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR

O R D E R

S.B.CRIMINAL MISC. PETITION NO. 491/2007
(Bhopal Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan)

Date of Order : 11/07/2007

PRESENT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.R.PANWAR

Mr. Suresh Kumbhat for the petitioner.
Mr. Ashok Upadhyay, public prosecutor for the State.

BY THE COURT:-

By the instant petition under section 482 Cr.P.C. the petitioner has challenged order dated 02.03.2007 passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Sojat, district Pali (for short 'the trial court' hereinafter) whereby while allowing the application filed by the petitioner under Section 457 Cr.P.C., the trial court ordered to release the tractor with trolley bearing No. M.P. 15-A/9589 in favour of the petitioner provided the petitioner furnishes a Supardginama of Rs.2,00,000 and a personal bond of the like amount as also to furnish a bank guarantee in the sum of Rs.10,000/- on certain conditions incorporated in the order. Aggrieved by the impugned order directing the petitioner to furnish the bank guarantee, the petitioner has filed the instant petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is the registered owner of the tractor in question which alleged to have been found carrying wood in contravention of the provisions of the Forest Act and the petitioner is not an accused in the case. It is also contended that the neemwood seized by the police is not forest produce. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is not in a position to furnish bank guarantee and therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the condition imposed by the trial court to furnish bank guarantee of Rs. 10,000/- is onerous and the vehicle in question may be released in favour of the petitioner on Supurdginama.

This Court in Jeet Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan 2006 (2) R.Cr.D. 274 (Raj.) without going into the question as to whether the goods being transported in the vehicle, in fact, is a forest produce or not as defined in the Rajasthan Forest Act, held that the condition of furnishing bank guarantee is onerous and accordingly the condition of bank guarantee has been set aside and vehicle has been ordered to be released on Supardginama.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, it is yet to be established in the trial as to whether the wood carried in the vehicle or transported, are forest produce or not, in my view, directing the petitioner to give the bank guarantee of Rs. 10,000/- appears to be a condition onerous and therefore, the ends

of justice would be met if the vehicle in question is released in favour of petitioner on supurdginama on furnishing solvent security instead of bank guarantee.

In the result, the order impugned dated 02.03.2007 passed by the trial court is modified to the extent that instead of giving bank guarantee of Rs. 10,000/-, the tractor with trolley in question shall be released in favour of the petitioner on Supurdinama on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- along with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial court with the stipulation therein that during the pendency of the criminal case, neither alienate nor transfer the said tractor and trolley and keep it in good condition and he will produce the same as and when directed by the trial court.

With the above modification, the petition is disposed of.

(H.R.PANWAR),J.

rp